establishment of a court at Changanacherri. He therefore requested that a court might be established at Changanacherri at an early date.

Dewan's reply.—During my recent tour in the taluk, the people presented a petition to me on this question. This petition has been referred to the High Court for remarks. The matter will be considered on receipt of the High Court's report.

39. The necessity for raising the pecuniary jurisdiction of the Devikulam District Munsiff's Court to Rs. 5,000.

Mr. A. J. Wright (Member, Kannan Devan Planters' Association) conveyed the thanks of the Association to His Highness' Government for the appointment of a Munsiff-Magistrate at Devikulam, and expressed the hope that the appointment, which was but tentative, would be made permanent.

He then pointed out that the comparatively low pecuniary jurisdiction of the court was not only a source of hardship to the would-be suitors but was also a serious financial loss to the Government. Almost all the cases with which the court would be called upon to deal had reference either to advances for labour or to valuable land. The estate owners annualy advanced thousands of rupees for the supply of labour and the labour contractors had heavy liabilities outstanding in their names. Those liabilities were so large that they often did not come within the jurisdiction of the court. Since 1086, the planters had to recover from the labour contractors a sum of Rs. 28,928. Out of that amount, they had to relinquish Rs. 9,275 in 10 suits, so as to make the amounts in the suits fall within the coguisance of the munsiff's court.

The other class of cases was largely concerned with cardamom lands, and one acre of ground was valued, for purposes of suit, at Rs. 1,000. Hence, the Member pointed out, that the jurisdiction of the court was limited to two acres of land or at the lowest calculation to not more than 4 acres of land. Practically, therefore, all such suits were beyond the present jurisdiction of the court. The difficulty was enhanced by the circumstance that the Devikulam Division alone had no District Court within its limits. Suitors had to go to distant Parur for the prosecution of their cases. Parur was 90 miles from Devikulam and the difficulties and expenses of the travel from Devikulam to Parur were indeed great. He added that the said distance necessitated the examination of witnesses on commission under the provisions of the Civil Courts Regulation. Such examination of witnesses and the relinquishment of large sums of money by suitors indirectly affected the Government income. To obviate all the above difficulties, the Member suggested that Section 12 of Regulation II of 1084 might be amended so as to raise the pecuniary jurisdiction of the Devikulam Munsiff's Court from Rs. 2,000 to Rs. 5,000, and he requested that his proposal might commend itself to the favorable consideration of the Government.

Dewan's reply.—Mr. Robinson is in favor of the proposal made by the Member. The matter will be referred to the High Court for remarks.

40. The necessity for special provisions in regard to interest awarded by Civil Courts and documents produced by witnesses before such Courts.

Mr. K. A. Krishna Pattar (Member, Trading Classes, Quilon) pointed out that, in almost all the decrees obtained from the civil courts in the State interest on the decree amounts was awarded at 6 per cent from the date of plaint. The rate was very low and it caused serious loss to the decree-holders. The civil suits often took 3 and 4 years for final adjudication and the low interest awarded for such long periods was highly prejudicial to the decree-holders. He therefore requested that the civil courts might be asked to award a higher rate of interest or to award interest at the rate agreed to between the parties in the transaction forming the subject-matter of the suit.

The Member then proceeded to consider the question of documents produced by witnesses before the civil courts and said that the inordinate detention of those documents in the courts seriously interfered with business, as the documents were necessary for the witnesses for frequent reference in their private transactions. He therefore suggested that the witnesses might be permitted to produce the original

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

document required, together with a copy thereof and that the courts should make arrangements to compare the copy with the original and return the latter to the witnesses then and there. He added that the expenses incurred by the witnesses should be made good to them by the party concerned. He requested that his suggestions might be favourably considered by the Government.

Dewan's reply.—The remarks of the Member will be referred to the High Court for opinion.

(4) Police.

41. Reforms to be introduced in the Police Department.

Mr. M. K. Madhavan Pillai (Member, Karunagapalli taluk) said that the reorganisation of the Police Department effected in 1088 M. E., did not contribute in any way to the good of the people, but that, since the said reorganisation, the department was drifting from bad to worse. The reorganisation simply gave enhanced powers and salaries to the higher officers of the department and also brought about some changes in their designations. The Member expressed the popular belief that the department could become thoroughly useful to the people at large only if the head of the department was one who knew the people intimately, their language, customs, manners and views. The appointment of a native of the country to the headship of the department would only bring in some savings to the Government under 'salary', as a native of the country would not have to be paid the same high salary as was being paid to foreigners. It would also tend to the co-ordination of the department with other departments in the State like the Excise Department. He also pointed out that, in the Native States of Mysore, Baroda and Cochin, the headship of the Police Department was conferred on natives and that the administration of the department in those places was carried on to the satisfaction of both the Government and the people. He therefore requested that the Government might be pleased to confer the appointment on a native officer of approved ability and character.

The Member next said that the Commissioner insisted on hearing complaints only in his office. That was an inconvenient and undesirable procedure on the part of an executive officer and he prayed that the same might be rectified.

The Member then proceeded to consider the competence and qualifications of the superior officers of the department. As regards the District Superintendents, the Member said that some of them were neither qualified nor competent to hold office. Some of the Circle Inspectors too were thoroughly unfit and their history of service would clearly show how undeserving they were of promotion. The pay of the Circle Inspectors was fixed far higher than that of the Magistrates and the innovation, the Member pointed out, was undesirable and it interfered seriously with the proper administration of justice by the latter. At the time of the reorganisation of the department, it was laid down by the Government that, as far as possible, only graduates should be entertained in the higher ranks of the service. But the Member observed that the above policy of the Government was not only not adhered to, but that those graduates who were already in the department were not sufficiently encouraged.

As regards the Circle Inspectors, the Member stated that the post was created for the purpose of conducting enquiries in important cases as well as the prosecution of such cases. The Circle Inspectors had not yet discharged the above two functions with any amount of credit, and the statistics for the said work would, if called for, unmistakably bear out the above statement. The Circle Inspectors now made rapid marches and gave some instructions to the Sub-Inspectors. But they always took care to connect themselves in some way with the investigation of important cases, so that they might excuse themselves from *conducting* those cases in view of the provision in the Criminal Procedure Code. The Member therefore said that the appointment of Circle Inspectors was a needless superfluity and might be dispensed with.

In regard to the Prosecuting Inspectors, the Member quoted statistics for the years since 1086 and showed that the out-turn of work of the Prosecuting Inspectors was quite inadequate. He therefore suggested that the Prosecuting Inspectors

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly